

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-25 are cancelled. Claims 26-86 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

The specification has been amended to correct a minor formatting error. No new matter has been added by these changes.

Claims 35-37, 49-51, 63-64, 68, 74-75, and 79 have been amended solely to have the claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 26-28, 30-31, 38, 40-42, 44-45, 52, 54-61, 64-66, 69-77, and 80-86 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dillon (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,615). It is submitted, however, that the claims are patentably distinguishable over Dillon.

The Dillon patent describes the transmission of data packets from a hub to an inside satellite receiver (ISR) of a personal computer (PC). Each data packet includes a destination address (DA) field that includes an individual/group (I/G) bit which indicates whether a destination address that follows it is a 39 bit individual address or a 47 bit multicast address. The ISR reads the I/G bit of each packet to determine whether the destination address of the packet is an individual address or a multicast address. When the I/G bit indicates the destination address is an individual address, the ISR reads the next 39 bits to obtain the destination address, and when the I/G bit indicates the destination address is a multicast address, the ISR reads the next 47 bits to obtain the destination address. The ISR then compares the destination address to those in a list of addresses of interest to determine whether the packet's

destination is of interest to the software being run on the PC. The ISR then decrypts the packet when (i) the ISR has determined that the packet's destination is of interest to the software and (ii) the ISR has received a decryption key associated with the packet's destination address. (See FIGS. 3 and 4; col. 3, lines 26-63; col. 4, lines 8-14 and 21-36; and col. 5, lines 54-67).

Dillon therefore identifies whether a 39 bit address or a 47 bit address is to be compared to addresses in the list of addresses of interest by reading a *single I/G bit* that is *not part of the destination address*. The patent does not disclose or suggest that a segment of the destination address is *identified by a stored mask sequence* and does not disclose or suggest that a corresponding segment of an address stored in the list of addresses is *identified by a stored mask sequence*.

Dillon does not disclose or suggest:

said portion of said received data being determined to be intended for said group by comparing at least a segment of said read address to a corresponding segment of a stored address that is associated with said group, said segment of said read address and said corresponding segment of said stored address being identified by a stored mask sequence

as called for in claim 26.

Dillon does not disclose or suggest the combination called for in claim 1 and therefore does not anticipate the claim.

Claims 26-28, 30-31, and 38 depend from claim 26 and are distinguishable over Dillon for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 40 is directed to an apparatus for processing received data and includes limitations similar to those set out in claim 26. It follows that claim 40 is patentably distinguishable over Dillon at least for the same reasons.

Claims 41-42, 44-45, and 52 depend from claim 40 and are distinguishable over Dillon for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 54 is directed to a readable medium recorded with instructions having limitations similar to those set out in claim 26. Therefore, claim 54 is patentably distinguishable over Dillon at least for the same reasons.

Independent claim 55 defines a method, independent claim 56 defines an apparatus, and independent claim 57 defines a readable medium, and each includes limitations similar to those recited in claim 26. Therefore, each of claims 55-57 is patentably distinguishable over Dillon for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 58 defines a method of processing data and includes:

attaching a control address to said portion of said data, said control address being associated with said corresponding address of a respective one of said plurality of processing devices when said portion of said data is intended solely for said respective one of said plurality of processing devices, at least a segment of said control address being associated with a group of said processing devices and being identifiable by a mask sequence associated with said group of said processing devices when said portion of said data is intended for each of said processing devices in said group.

At least for the reasons described above regarding claim 26, claim 58 is patentably distinguishable over Dillon

Claims 59-61 and 64-66 depend from claim 58 and are distinguishable over Dillon at least for the same reasons.

Independent claim 69 defines an apparatus for processing data that includes limitations similar to those set out in claim 58. It follows that claim 69 is patentably distinguishable over Dillon at least for the same reasons.

Claims 70-77 depend from claim 69 and are distinguishable over Dillon for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 80 defines a recording medium, independent claim 81 defines a method, independent claim 82

defines an apparatus, and independent claim 83 defines a recording medium, and each of claims 80-83 includes limitations similar to those set out in claim 58. At least for the same reasons, claims 80-83 are patentably distinguishable over Dillon.

Independent claim 84 defines a method that includes limitations similar to those set out in claims 26 and 58, independent claim 85 defines a system that includes limitations similar to those set out in claims 40 and 69, and independent claim 86 defines a recording medium having limitations similar to those set out in claims 54 and 80. Therefore, each of claims 84-86 is patentably distinguishable over Dillon for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

The Examiner also rejected claims 33-36, 47-50, 62-63, and 73-74 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dillon in view of Chiu (U.S. Patent No. 5,784,597). It is submitted, however, that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 33-36 depend from claim 26, claims 47-50 depend from claim 40, claims 62-63 depend from claim 58, and claims 73-74 depend from claim 69. Therefore, each of claims 33-36, 47-50, 62-63, and 73-74 is distinguishable over Dillon for at least the same reasons. The Chiu patent does not remedy these deficiencies.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner also objected to claims 29, 32, 37, 39, 43, 46, 51, 53, 67-68, and 78-79 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicated that the claims would be allowable if rewritten. Claims 29, 32, 37, and 39 depend from claim 26, claims 43, 46, 51, and 53 depend from claim 40,

claims 67-68 depend from claim 58, and claim 78-79 depend from claim 69. For the reasons described above regarding these independent claims, it is submitted that claims 29, 32, 37, 39, 43, 46, 51, 53, 67-68, and 78-79 are in condition for allowance.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: August 4, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant